

VOTER GUIDES FROM OTHER STATES/CITIES

(excerpts)

BALLOT MEASURE SUMMARY ★★★

PROP 81 California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act of 2006.

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by the Legislature*

This act provides for a bond issue in an amount not to exceed a total of six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) to provide funds for the construction and renovation of public library facilities in order to expand access to reading and literacy programs in California's public education system and to expand access to public library services for all residents of California. Fiscal Impact: State cost of about \$1.2 billion over 30 years to pay off both the principal (\$600 million) and interest (\$570 million) costs of the bonds. One-time local costs (statewide) of about \$320 million for local matching contributions.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES

A YES vote on this measure means: The state could sell \$600 million in bonds to provide grants to local agencies for the construction, renovation, and/or expansion of local library facilities. Local agencies would contribute about \$320 million of their own funds towards these projects.

NO

A NO vote on this measure means: The state could not sell \$600 million in bonds for these purposes.

ARGUMENTS

PRO

Proposition 81 builds new community libraries and renovates old ones. It encourages school-library partnerships and helps fight illiteracy, without tax increases. \$600 million in state matching funds combines with local funding to provide safe havens for children after school and greater library access for seniors, businesses, disabled, and families.

CON

Free spending politicians have misspent our money. We should not spend \$9 billion a year on welfare for illegal aliens, and then borrow money for libraries. A no vote forces free spending politicians to cut welfare for illegal aliens to pay for our libraries. Vote No on Proposition 81.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Nancy Mooney
Yes for Libraries
1215 19th St. #200
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-737-9325
mooneyna@aol.com
www.yesforlibraries.com

AGAINST

Thomas N. Hudson
Executive Director
California Taxpayer
Protection Committee
9971 Base Line Road
Elverta, CA 95626-9411
916-991-9300
info@protecttaxpayers.com
www.protecttaxpayers.com

PROP 82 Preschool Education. Tax on Incomes Over \$400,000 for Individuals; \$800,000 for Couples. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures*

Establishes voluntary preschool education for all four-year olds. Funded by 1.7% tax on individual income over \$400,000; couples' income over \$800,000. Fiscal Impact: Increased annual revenues of \$2.1 billion in 2007–08, growing with the economy in future years. All revenues would be spent on the new preschool program.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES

A YES vote on this measure means: The state would make a free, voluntary, half-day public preschool program available to all 4-year olds. The state would impose a new tax on high-income taxpayers to pay for the new program.

NO

A NO vote on this measure means: The state would not: (1) establish a new preschool program available to all 4-year olds or (2) impose a new tax on high-income taxpayers to pay for such a program. (The state and federal governments would continue to provide existing public preschool services, primarily to children of low-income families.)

ARGUMENTS

PRO

PROP. 82 WILL PREPARE MORE CHILDREN TO READ AND LEARN, WHICH WILL STRENGTHEN K–12 EDUCATION. It encourages parental involvement, expands teacher training, has no cost for 99.4% of taxpayers, and provides for independent audits and criminal penalties for misuse of funds. Groups representing 450,000 classroom teachers say YES on 82.

CON

Proposition 82 is the wrong approach. Let's fix K–12 first before creating a new education bureaucracy and spending \$2.4 billion per year for only a 4–5% increase in preschool enrollment. There are better, more cost-effective ways to expand preschool. Please vote NO on 82.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Yes on 82, Preschool for All
1171 South Robertson Blvd.,
Suite 182
Los Angeles, CA 90035
310-786-7605
info@yeson82.com
www.YesOn82.com

AGAINST

Stop the Reiner Initiative
—No on 82
3001 Douglas Blvd.,
Suite 225
Roseville, CA 95661
916-218-6640
info@NoProp82.org
www.NoProp82.org

Advisory Measure No. 1



Ballot Title

Advisory ballot measure No. 1 concerns the right to health care.

If approved, the measure would advise the mayor and city council that every person in the U.S. should have an equal right to quality health care, and that Congress should implement that right. The measure would advise the City to take steps to secure that right, including: requesting legislation, supporting education and advocacy, publishing a report on local health-care access, and convening an expert panel to advise the City and private employers on improving insurance coverage for Seattle residents.

Should this advisory measure be approved?

Yes.....

No.....

Full Text

AN ORDINANCE submitting an advisory ballot measure concerning health care to the qualified electors of the City of Seattle, at the general election to be held on November 8, 2005; calling upon the City Clerk to certify the proposed measure to the Director of Elections of King County; and requesting the Director of Records and Elections to submit the measure to the qualified electors.

WHEREAS, the Seattle City Council recognizes that it is increasingly difficult for many Seattle residents to obtain quality health care; and

WHEREAS, providing access to quality health care has moved the Seattle City Council to adopt Resolutions 30673 and 30582, both aimed at addressing health-care issues for citizens of the City of Seattle; and

WHEREAS, an estimated 11 percent of adults in Seattle do not have health insurance; and

WHEREAS, the number of uninsured children in Washington state has reached the highest level in more than a decade; and

WHEREAS, an estimated 50 percent of Washington state residents do not have dental insurance or rely on Medicaid for coverage; and

WHEREAS, Seattle's community health centers and public health primary care clinics have a common mission to provide treatment for individuals regardless of their ability to pay; and

WHEREAS, in 2003, Seattle-based community health centers reported that 37 percent of patients for medical care and 42 percent of dental patients were uninsured or did not have the means to pay for their treatment; and

WHEREAS, as the costs of providing health and dental care continue to increase, Seattle's community health centers and public health primary care clinics struggle to provide uncompensated care; and

WHEREAS, the lack of a rational system for funding and providing universal access to quality health care has led to a rapid increase in health-care costs in the United States, which now has the world's highest per-capita health-care costs; and

WHEREAS, despite these high costs, the United States lags behind many other developed nations in terms of many indicators of its citizens' health, including life-expectancy and infant mortality; and

WHEREAS, rising health-care costs have affected employers' ability to provide health-care benefits for their workers and have sharply increased the costs of doing business; and

WHEREAS, the costs to the City of Seattle of providing health-care benefits to its employees has risen while City revenue has not kept pace; and

WHEREAS, only a rational system for financing and delivering quality health care will help ensure that all Americans have access to these necessary services at a cost that is reasonable to them and to their employers, including the City of Seattle; and

WHEREAS, at least eighteen states have introduced legislation regarding universal health care including California, Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, New York and Vermont; and

WHEREAS, concerted action is necessary to encourage the United States Congress and other decision makers to design and fund a rational health care system;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE ADVISORY

The current health care system is under great strain. The cost of

City Attorney's Explanatory Statement

The effect of the advisory measure if approved:

This is an advisory measure and by itself would change no laws. Instead, voters would advise the mayor and city council members that every person in the United States should have the right to health care of equal high quality, and that Congress should immediately enact legislation to implement this right.

The measure also would advise the City to take the necessary steps to help realize this right for Seattle residents and others. These steps would include but would not be limited to the following:

- Asking Washington state and congressional lawmakers to adopt legislation that provides universal access to high-quality health care.
- Asking Washington state legislators to support the City's efforts and work toward the goal of universal access to high-quality health care.
- Supporting advocacy and public education on the issue of high-quality universal health care.
- Researching ways that the City Council can improve health-care access for the uninsured.
- Compiling data and publishing an annual report on local health-care indicators, including information on access to health care.
- Convening a panel of experts to prepare a report and make recommendations to the City about specific steps that the City and private employers could take to prove insurance coverage for Seattle residents.

Full Text (continued)

health care increases annually at three to four times the rate of inflation.

An estimated 11% of the citizens of Seattle have no health insurance at all. Low-income adults are 10 times more likely to lack coverage than those of higher incomes. The fastest growing segment of the uninsured are the poorest families, those earning less than the federal poverty level (FPL). In all, over 60% of the uninsured are low income. Despite the rising number of uninsured children and adults, the rate of employer-based insurance continues to decrease. The percentage of people insured through their employers dropped to its lowest point in over 10 years - 60.2%. Children are significantly affected. In Washington State, there are now over 95,000 uninsured children or 5.8% of the state's children. While the United States has the wealthiest health care system in the world it is unable to ensure basics like pre-natal care and immunizations. The U.S. trails most of the developed world on such indicators as infant mortality and life expectancy. Widely differing proposals are being discussed to address the crisis in U.S. health care. This advisory ballot makes no judgments upon these various efforts. It serves only to provide the residents of Seattle with an opportunity to speak with a unified voice in advising the City of Seattle to take concerted action to help ensure that every person in Seattle and, ultimately, the United States as a whole, has equal access to quality health care.

As such, do you agree that the voters give the following advisory to the Mayor and City Council members of the City of Seattle:

Every person in the United States should have the right to health care of equal high quality. The Congress should immediately enact legislation to implement this right.

The City should also take the necessary steps to help realize this right for Seattle residents and others, including but not limited to the following:

- Ask Washington State representatives and senators in the U.S. Congress to adopt legislation that provides universal access to quality health care.
- Ask the Washington State legislators to support our efforts and work toward this goal.
- Support education of the public about this issue and support advocacy on this issue.
- Research ways that the City Council can improve health care access for the uninsured.
- Compile data and publish an annual report on local health care indicators including information on access to health care.
- Convene a panel of experts to prepare a report and make recommendations to the City about specific steps the City and Seattle private employers could take to improve insurance coverage for Seattle residents.

Advisory Measure No. 1

Statement For Advisory Measure No. 1

Our "Yes!" vote on Advisory Ballot Measure No. 1 will drive home to our elected representatives from City Hall to Washington, DC, that the people of Seattle consider quality health care the right of everyone in the United States.

Not a privilege, restricted to people with insurance, but the birthright of every man, woman and child.

This is a totally new use of the ballot. No measure quite like this has ever before been presented to the electorate. We, the people of Seattle, have a dramatic opportunity to sound a call for action that will resonate throughout the land.

In Abraham Lincoln's phrase, this measure is "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Recognizing what nearly everyone now acknowledges, that our health care system is in deepening crisis, the Puget Sound Alliance for Retired Americans and Health Care for All — Washington launched a bold initiative.

These two low-budget organizations, staffed entirely by volunteers, conceived of a way to give all Seattle an opportunity to endorse the idea of health care as a right.

People at the grassroots gathered more than 11,500 signatures of Seattle residents on petitions in support of this fundamental principle. A grassroots delegation presented the petitions to our City Council and won their unanimous agreement to place the measure on the ballot.

No profit-oriented special interest had any part in this endeavor.

We in the United States spend more per capita on health care than any other nation. Yet 48 million of our people are uninsured. Other millions find the coverage offered by their employers eroding or disappearing entirely. Millions confront continually rising out-of-pocket costs — premiums, co-pays and deductibles. City, county, state and federal governments labor to keep abreast of health care's budget-busting inflation.

Deepening public concern has given rise to widely differing corrective proposals. This ballot measure takes no position for or against any of these proposals.

Instead, it provides the people of Seattle with an historic opportunity to initiate a nation-wide movement for a solution — a movement directed toward action by the federal government, which alone has resources commensurate to the task.

Health care is indeed a right. With Advisory Ballot Measure No. 1, we can take a pioneering first step toward making this right a reality throughout the land.

Every "Yes" vote on Advisory Ballot Measure No. 1 adds weight to this grassroots citizen mandate for action.

Rebuttal of Statement Against

The current system of health care is failing. Last year Harborview Hospital alone provided over \$90,000,000 of health care to the uninsured. This is a national issue that profoundly affects the lives of people in Seattle and the City alone cannot meet the need.

More and more working men and women are without health care. The crisis has reached the point that we cannot afford to wait any longer. A strong yes" vote will be a message from this community for quality health care. A "yes" vote will add Seattle to the list of communities which are sending a strong message that we must have a solution.

It's appropriate for our elected City representatives to concern themselves with the health care of the people of our City. Indeed, few if any civic responsibilities rank higher.

Vote "Yes" to voice your support that everyone has a right to quality health care.

Statements Prepared By:

Will Parry, Steve Williamson, and Brian King

Statement Against Advisory Measure No. 1

Too few people have access to health care insurance. Those who have it pay far too much. **Everyone** should have access to affordable, quality health care. These core problems with America's health care system must be fixed.

But, should we - indeed, **can** we - fix those problems with more studies conducted by City politicians? Do we want people like those who brought you Seattle's monorail fiasco now turning their attention to universal health care?

Should the City Council convene a panel of "experts" with your money? Should the Seattle City Council compile data, and conduct research for the purpose of advising or demanding action by state legislators and federal politicians - all at great cost to City residents?

If the City Council had any realistic chance of solving America's health care problems we'd be the first to demand action, but they don't. Yet all this convening of experts, compiling data and conducting research will cost money - money we think the City Council should spend taking care of Seattle's real City business.

City Council Resolution 30673 already calls upon the City's Labor-Management Health Care Committee "to investigate options" in providing health care to City employees. Resolution 30582 already establishes an "independent Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee." All, of course, at taxpayer expense. How many experts and committees does it take to just find less expensive drugs and health care plans for the City?

If this advisory ballot passes, the City Council will not consult **you** about your health care needs. Instead, it will consult so-called "experts," and other health care industry professionals who work for pharmaceutical companies and who will explain why the City Council should endorse plans likely to put more money in the hands of the expert's corporate sponsors. Why should your money be spent on that?

This advisory ballot is intended to "provide the residents of Seattle with an opportunity to speak with a unified voice in advising the City of Seattle." But, we don't need some "unified" voice created by wasting taxpayer resources. People interested in working on health care issues can simply pick up the phone and call up City Council members right now - assuming City Council members can do anything about these problems.

Please vote "NO" on the Health Care Advisory proposal. Our City Council has more important things to do with our money.

Rebuttal of Statement For

By "universal health care," proponents mean they want higher taxes and more regulation rather than choices. But in a free country, who should make your health care decisions... politicians, or **you**? Please vote "NO."

Statements Prepared By:

The Libertarian Party of King County

Scott Lindsley, County Chair

(425) 641-8247

www.LPWS.org

Measure 31

Senate Joint Resolution 19—Referred to the Electorate of Oregon by the 2003 Legislative Assembly to be voted on at the General Election, November 2, 2004.

Ballot Title

31

AMENDS CONSTITUTION: AUTHORIZES LAW PERMITTING POSTPONEMENT OF ELECTION FOR PARTICULAR PUBLIC OFFICE WHEN NOMINEE FOR OFFICE DIES

RESULT OF “YES” VOTE: “Yes” vote amends constitution to authorize law providing that an election for a particular public office may be postponed when nominee for that office dies.

RESULT OF “NO” VOTE: “No” vote retains existing law, which contains no provision permitting postponement of an election for a particular public office when nominee for that office dies.

SUMMARY: Amends constitution. Current law does not provide for the enactment of a law postponing an election for a particular public offices when a nominee for that office dies. Measure authorizes the legislature to enact a law permitting postponement of an election for a particular public office when a candidate nominated for that office dies; in that circumstance, the legislature may enact a law: (1) allowing the postponement of the regularly scheduled election for the office in question; (2) allowing the office in question to be filled at a subsequent election; and (3) prohibiting the votes cast for candidates at the regularly scheduled election for the office in question from being considered. Measure does not affect election process for other candidates or measures on the ballot.

ESTIMATE OF FINANCIAL IMPACT: There is no financial effect on state or local government expenditures or revenues.

Text of Measure

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

PARAGRAPH 1. The Constitution of the State of Oregon is amended by creating a new section 24 to be added to and made a part of Article II, such section to read:

SECTION 24. When any vacancy occurs in the nomination of a candidate for elective public office in this state, and the vacancy is due to the death of the candidate, the Legislative Assembly may provide by law that:

(1) The regularly scheduled election for that public office may be postponed;

(2) The public office may be filled at a subsequent election; and

(3) Votes cast for candidates for the public office at the regularly scheduled election may not be considered.

PARAGRAPH 2. The amendment proposed by this resolution shall be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection at the next regular general election held throughout this state.

NOTE: **Boldfaced** type indicates new language; [brackets and italic] type indicates deletions or comments.

Explanatory Statement

Ballot Measure 31 amends the Oregon Constitution to allow the Legislative Assembly to enact laws that postpone an election for an elective public office if a candidate nominated for that office dies before the election. Current law does not allow the postponement of an election when a nominee for public office dies before the election.

Most elections in Oregon are conducted by mail. Under current law, if a candidate nominated for public office dies after ballots have been mailed to voters, the name of a new nominee is not required to be printed on any replacement ballot. If the candidate who has died receives the highest number of votes, either the incumbent holding the office remains until a successor is elected and qualified or a vacancy in the office results. For most public offices, vacancies are filled by appointment.

Ballot Measure 31 allows the Legislative Assembly to pass laws that change this result. The laws would apply only in cases when a candidate nominated for elective public office dies before the election and would provide that: (1) The regularly scheduled election for that office be postponed; (2) The office be filled at a subsequent special election; and (3) Votes cast for candidates for the office at the regularly scheduled election may not be considered, and the surviving candidates must stand for and campaign for a subsequent special election.

Ballot Measure 31 is needed to provide exceptions to other provisions of the Oregon Constitution that state that the person who receives the highest number of votes is elected and that require certain offices to be filled at the general election.

At its 2003 regular session, the Legislative Assembly passed a law that will take effect only if Ballot Measure 31 is approved by the people. The law applies only to candidates nominated by a major political party for the office of Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, Attorney General, state Senator or state Representative. If a candidate nominated by a major political party for one of those offices dies within 30 days of a November general election, the election for that office only will be postponed. The Secretary of State will call a subsequent special election and the ballots cast for that office at the November general election may not be counted.

Committee Members:

Senator Rick Metsger
Representative Betsy Close
Representative Bill Garrard
Representative Wayne Krieger
Representative Cliff Zauner

Appointed by:

President of the Senate
Speaker of the House
Secretary of State
Members of the Committee

(This committee was appointed to provide an impartial explanation of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.215.)

Measure 31 Arguments

Legislative Argument in Support

Ballot Measure 31 updates Oregon law to protect the right of the people of Oregon to determine by election the positions of Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, Attorney General, State Senator and State Representative. The Oregon Legislature passed Senate Bill 552 during the 2003 session to provide for a major political party to replace its nominee during the general election if the nominee of that party dies within 30 days of a general election.

Ballot Measure 31 makes the constitutional change necessary to allow Senate Bill 552 to take effect.

Under current law, if a deceased candidate receives the highest number of votes, either the incumbent holding the office remains until a successor is elected or a vacancy in the office results. For most public offices, vacancies are filled by appointment.

Recently, candidates in other states have died shortly before general elections. Those states have had procedures in place to allow elections to continue. Oregon currently has no procedures in place to postpone the vote-by-mail election for that office in such a situation. Ballot Measure 31 provides authority for a special election to be conducted to allow a replacement candidate to be placed on the ballot and considered by voters.

Ballot Measure 31 ensures that the voters, not the appointment process, will determine who is elected to office. Ballot Measure 31 maintains the integrity of Oregon's election process by ensuring that their "elected" representatives are indeed elected by the people.

We urge your support for Ballot Measure 31.

Committee Members:

Senator Rick Metsger
Representative Brad Avakian
Representative Vic Backlund

Appointed by:

President of the Senate
Speaker of the House
Secretary of State

(This Joint Legislative Committee was appointed to provide the legislative argument in support of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.245.)

Note: No arguments, other than the Legislative Argument in Support, were filed with the Secretary of State.

nyc ballot proposals: question 3

NYC CAMPAIGN FINANCE BOARD 2005 GENERAL ELECTION VOTER GUIDE

- [Question 3: Plain-language Summary](#) (prepared by the Campaign Finance Board)
- [What You Will See on the Ballot](#)
- [Pro and Con Arguments](#) (prepared by the Campaign Finance Board)
- [Statements from the Public - Pro](#)
- [Statements from the Public - Con](#)

QUESTION 3: Ethics Code for City Administrative Judges

(summary prepared by the Campaign Finance Board)

Currently, Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) and Hearing Officers who preside over the City's administrative tribunals are not generally subject to a uniform code of professional conduct covering their judicial duties, but are subject only to the City's general Conflicts of Interest Law. The proposed amendment to the City Charter requires the Mayor and the Chief ALJ of the Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings, a City agency with authority to conduct administrative hearings for other City agencies, jointly to issue rules establishing a code of professional conduct for the City's ALJs and Hearing Officers, after consulting with the City's Conflicts of Interest Board, the Commissioner of Investigation, and all affected agency and tribunal heads. ALJs and Hearing Officers would be subject to disciplinary action for violating the new rules.

[TOP](#)

WHAT YOU WILL SEE ON THE BALLOT

QUESTION 3. Ethics Code for City Administrative Judges

These changes to the City Charter, as proposed by the New York City Charter Revision Commission, would require the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Law Judge of the Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings to jointly issue rules establishing a code or codes of professional conduct for the administrative law judges and hearing officers in the City's administrative tribunals. Shall the proposed changes be adopted?

NOTE: QUESTIONS MAY BE NUMBERED DIFFERENTLY ON THE BALLOT

[TOP](#)

Pro and Con Arguments(prepared by the Campaign Finance Board)

QUESTION 3: Ethics Code for City Administrative Judges	
<p>Reasons to Vote YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed Charter amendment to establish a code of conduct for the City's administrative law judges will offer needed centralized coordination of the City's various tribunals and increase their professionalism. This proposal will encourage uniform conduct among administrative judges, improving the fairness, uniformity, and efficiency of hearings.	<p>Reasons to Vote NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A Charter amendment is not necessary to create the proposed code of conduct, which could be created by legislation or executive order.• The proposal gives no specifics about either the content of the code or the process by which the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Law Judge will develop it. The voters therefore have insufficient information to make a meaningful decision about the proposal.

[TOP](#)

STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

ETHICS CODE FOR CITY ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGES — PRO

LIST OF SUBMITTERS

[Dr. Ester R. Fuchs](#) (Charter Revision Commission, Chair)

[Robert Abrams](#) (Charter Revision Commission, Member; former Attorney General of New York)

[Michael R. Bloomberg](#) (Mayor of New York City)

[Citizens Union](#)

[Mario Cuomo](#) (former Governor of New York State)

[David Dinkins](#) (former Mayor of New York City)

[Stephen J. Fiala](#) (Charter Revision Commission, Secretary; County Clerk and Commissioner of Jurors of Richmond County)

[Dall Forsythe](#) (Charter Revision Commission, Vice-Chair)

[League of Women Voters](#) (Adrienne Kivelson, Election Specialist)

[Helen Marshall](#) (Queens Borough President)

Dr. Ester R. Fuchs (Charter Revision Commission, Chair)

The proposals that the 2005 Charter Revision Commission have placed before voters, following a year of careful study and extensive outreach to all communities, will strengthen the integrity of both the City's administrative justice system (Question #3) and the process of planning and implementing the City's \$50 billion budget (Question #4).

During the 1970s fiscal crisis, the State began requiring the City to balance its budget in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles; prepare a four year financial plan; conduct an annual audit; and restrict its short-term debt.

These requirements have promoted responsible budgeting and fiscal practices, but they are expected to expire during the next mayor's term. New Yorkers can't afford to let that happen.

By voting "YES" on Question #4, voters can make these requirements part of the City Charter. The proposal has won strong support from civic leaders, elected officials, and government watchdogs on all sides of the political spectrum. The same is true for Question #3, which would lead to the creation of a uniform code of ethics – currently, none exists – governing the City's administrative judges.

Voting "YES" on Questions #3 and #4 will help ensure that New York City's future will have a strong, stable municipal finance system and a transparent and ethical government.

[TOP](#)

Robert Abrams (Charter Revision Commission, Member; Former Attorney General of New York)

In the mid 1970s, New York’s Governor Hugh Carey along with leaders from organized labor and Wall Street saved New York City from bankruptcy, by taking bold steps to bring the City’s finances under control. In 1975, Governor Cary signed into law the Financial Emergency Act (FEA), which established essential budgetary requirements that restrained irresponsible borrowing and spending which helped New York to get back on its feet. These safeguards have remained in place and have helped to strengthen New York’s fiscal health and stability over the last 30 years. However, these important fiscal reforms are scheduled to expire. We simply cannot afford to let that happen. Ballot Question #4, by placing the FEA’s core requirements into the City Charter, offers voters a chance to secure a more stable economic future for our great city.

Ballot Question #3, which would require a uniform ethics code for administrative judges, offers the opportunity to strengthen and improve the accountability of the city’s tribunals.

Both of these proposed additions to the New York City Charter would strengthen municipal government in a nonpartisan fashion, and both deserve the support of all New Yorkers.

[TOP](#)

Michael R. Bloomberg (Mayor of New York City)

Last year, I appointed a Charter Revision Commission to examine ways to improve city government, and I am pleased that the Commission has produced two proposals that have won broad bi-partisan support from New Yorkers: requiring a new ethics code for the City’s administrative judges, and making permanent the fiscal safeguards that have served our City well since the 1970’s.

Not only did these safeguards help New York avoid bankruptcy during the 1970s, they helped us climb out of the severe fiscal crisis that followed 9/11. By adopting balanced budgets under these rules for the last 25 years, we’ve restored public confidence in New York City’s financial integrity.

This year, the City’s bonds earned their highest-ever rating – an A+, which means lower borrowing costs and real savings to taxpayers. Over a 30-year period, we will save \$200 million for each year of new borrowing.

The state law mandating these safeguards, however, will soon expire. By adopting them into the City Charter now, we can help secure New York’s future for the next generation.

On election day, I hope you will join me – and a broad, bi-partisan coalition of New Yorkers from every borough – in voting “YES” on Questions #3 and #4.

[TOP](#)

Citizens Union

CITIZENS UNION, a citywide good government organization founded in 1897, remains troubled by the way in which Mayoral

Charter Commissions are sometimes used to make changes to the City Charter that may not be necessary in order for the functioning of government to be improved. A case in point is the proposed change requiring that the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Law Judge at the Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings consult with the Conflicts of Interest Board, the Department of Investigations and the heads of appropriate agencies and administrative tribunals and, then establish a uniform code of conduct or ethics for Administrative Law Judges and hearing officers. Though Citizens Union has concerns about the charter worthiness of this change since we believe that the change could have been affected either through executive order or City Council action, Citizens Union believes that the proposal itself is meritorious and needed. For that reason alone, Citizens Union supports the proposal and urges voters to **VOTE YES**.

[TOP](#)

Mario Cuomo (former Governor of New York State)

Those of us who were on the scene in 1975, and have stayed in touch with it since then, know that one of the most significant political achievements of the last three decades has been the establishment of the Fiscal Control Board and MAC by Governor Hugh Carey. Without those devices the City might have been officially bankrupted and its credit rating permanently impaired. All the Governors and New York City Mayors since then have recognized the value of the disciplines enforced by the Board and the opportunities provided the City by MAC. The two Charter change recommendations in question seek to secure those advantages by adding them to the City Charter. I commend the Commission and support those recommendations. They will preserve what have become useful constraints without losing anything of value.

[TOP](#)

David Dinkins (former Mayor of New York City)

The fiscal reforms that the State imposed on the City in the mid-1970s have provided important support to both Democratic and Republican mayors over the last three decades. In addition to mandating a balanced budget, an annual audit, and limits on short-term debt, the State required the City to follow Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, which diminish opportunities for budgetary sleights of hand.

These reforms have helped mayors keep the books in order – and in the black. Today, in part because no mayor has been able to engage in dangerous budget gimmickry or irresponsible borrowing, the City's fiscal health is stronger than ever.

This year, by voting "Yes" on Question Four, New Yorkers can adopt these good-government reforms into the City Charter before the state law mandating them expires. In addition, Question Three offers voters an opportunity to create a universal ethics code for administrative judges, who hear a wide range of cases, from parking tickets to consumer complaints.

Both questions present voters with sensible and needed reforms that will strengthen the integrity of City government, and both deserve your support on Election Day.